



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ures three varieties; in 1683 Worlidge¹ names it among culinary herbs in England, but says it is more valued for medicine; in 1778 Mawe² describes six varieties, and says generally cultivated in the kitchen garden, and in 1806³ McMahon includes it in his list of kitchen aromatics for American gardens. It is mentioned among European garden plants by Albertus Magnus⁴ in the thirteenth century, and in nearly all the later botanies, Ray⁵ enumerating it as also an ornamental plant, in nine varieties. As an ornamental plant is it yet deserving of notice, but its present use in American gardens must be very limited. It is mentioned by Paulus Ægnita,⁶ in the seventh century, as a medicinal plant.

Hyssop is called in France *hyssope*; in Germany, *Isop*;⁷ in Flanders and Holland, *hijsoop*; in Denmark, *isop*; in Italy, *issopo*; in Spain, *hisopo*; in Arabic, *zoofoe yeabus*, *ushnaz-daoud*.⁸

EDITORS' TABLE.

EDITORS: E. D. COPE AND J. S. KINGSLEY.

There can be no "privileged classes" among scientific workers. As the exact truth is the object of their labors, personal authority does not exist for them except in so far as the reputation of a man for accuracy will sustain his assertions, where the evidence cannot be obtained from the subject-matter itself. It is dangerous for a man holding a superior place in a scientific laboratory or museum to require subscription to his views on the part of his subordinates apart from their conviction of their truth, since if there be error, it is thus all the more widely advertised, and the hostile criticism is the more general. It is dangerous for subordinates to adopt views on the strength of authority alone, unless means of verification are

¹ Syst. Hort., by J. W. Gent, 1683, 220.

² Mawe. Gard., 1778.

³ McMahon. Am. Gard. Kal., 1806.

⁴ Albertus Magnus. De Veg., Jessen ed., 1887, 581.

⁵ Ray. Hist., 1686, 516.

⁶ Paulus Ægenita. Bruns. ed., 1531, 68.

⁷ Vilmorin. Les Pl. Pot., 283.

⁸ Birdwood. Veg. Prod. of Bomb., 62.

wanting. Nor has science anything to do with national prejudice. There can be no English, no French, and no German schools. Investigation makes all things even, and credit will be awarded to priority wherever the work be done. But there is another kind of "privilege" which is more insidious, and against this the real producers in the scientific field cannot too fully protect themselves. This is the assumption of credit for work not done, by the appliances of art and other means at the command of wealth. The scientific pretender who introduces names without definitions, or the wealthy man who publishes pictures, and claims to have made scientific discoveries on the strength of the work of an artist only, may make a considerable popular reputation. The man who in ordinary print only, claims discoveries not his own, is easily disposed of; but if he fortify himself with new classical expressions or with good pictures, he produces an impression, even among men of science, who are not familiar with the facts. This is especially true of those publishers who can employ good artists. Such is the effect of a pretty picture on the average naturalist, that one begins to question whether after all science is not a branch of art, and the true scientists are the artists. Of the value of good illustrations we make no question, but that they can set aside analytical scientific descriptions is a proposition that none but some highly "privileged" person can possibly make. Illustrations on a large scale can be furnished but slowly in some parts of the world, owing to their cost; and in other cases owing to the very large amount of material to be figured. In such cases the scientific results cannot be withheld; and descriptions without figures will, and, if they are good, ought to precede the illustrated works. To ignore such work is only the part of indolence; and none but "privileged" persons can afford to be indolent. It has always been the way of this class to enter in and divide the spoil; but science recognizes no proprietary rights. Such persons and their admirers talk grandiloquently of the disinterestedness of the true man of science, and of the sublime indifference to all personal questions which possesses him. But we have always noticed that these very persons resent highly any invasion of their self-assumed privileges; and they are right, in so far as any credit which inheres in them is not granted by others. Scientific, like other men, must live, and their reputation

is the basis of their livelihood. They should then, and in the long run will, refuse to grant especial privileges to either position or wealth, but will expect work to be rewarded by recognition, and will rigorously exclude pretensions based on art or mere nomenclature. This they will do as necessary self-preservation, whenever the tendency may be in an opposite direction.

We regret to read in our esteemed contemporary, the *American Geologist*, an editorial apology for what most scientific men disapprove. We refer to the purchase of the scientific work of a man and the publication of it by the purchaser as though it was his own production. While this kind of a contract is perhaps legal, it is disreputable to the purchaser. A man under necessity for the means of a livelihood may make such a sale of himself without blame; but the man who buys, cannot in this way get a sound scientific reputation. Works of art placed before the public in this way, have been the cause of prosecution of a charge of false pretence against the pseudo-producer. We refer to the Belt case in London, where busts sold as the work of Belt were found to have been purchased by him from the real artist. Belt was mulcted in damages by the court after a trial which attracted much attention. But whatever the law may be, the moral obliquity and intellectual poverty that such a transaction implies on the part of the purchaser, are too plain for dispute.

RECENT LITERATURE.

BAUR'S MORPHOGENY OF THE CARPUS AND TARSUS OF THE VERTEBRATA.¹—The first portion of Dr. Baur's work upon the above subject deals with the Batrachia, excluding the Salientia; the second will treat of the Sauropsida; the third of the Mammalia. The orders of Batrachia accepted are the Ganocephala of Owen; the Rhachitomi, Embolomeri, and Stegocephala of Cope; the Proteida, Urodela, and Anura. To the Ganocephala belong the most ancient of four-footed vertebrates, but Archegosaurus

¹ Beiträge zur Morphogenie des Carpus und Tarsus der Vertebraten, von Dr. G. Baur. I Theil. Batrachia. Jena, Verlag von Gustav, Fischer.